



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/273,149 03/19/99 PINTAR

K 22074661-255

EXAMINER

TM02/0103

BAKER & MCKENZIE
805 THIRD AVENUE
NEW YORK NY 10022

PAULA C	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER

2176

DATE MAILED:

01/03/01

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/273,149	Applicant(s) PINTAR ET AL.	
	Examiner CESAR B PAULA	Art Unit 2176	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 October 2000.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. & 119(e).

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|--|
| 15) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 18) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ |
| 16) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 19) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 17) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) <u>3</u> | 20) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to the IDS filed on 7/20/00, and amendment filed on 3/19/99.

This action is made final.

2. Claims 1-20 are pending in the case. Claims 1, 8, and 15 are independent claims.

Drawings

3. This application has been filed with informal drawings which are acceptable for examination purposes only. Formal drawings will be required when the application is allowed.

Information Disclosure Statement

4. The IDS has not been consider for listing a second time references cited in PTO- 892, paper 2.

Claim Objections

5. Appropriate corrections were made to claim 10, therefore its objection has been withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

7. Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Mcallum (Pat. # 5,784,635, 7/21/98).

Regarding independent claim 1, Mcallum discloses: *A method of converting a plurality of input fields... ..* --“Upon receiving the imported source data, it is then converted into a uniform

Art Unit: 2176

text format.....” (Col. 6, lines 40-67). Mcallum teaches above, the conversion of an input source data file into a second output file with an uniform format.

Moreover, Mcallum discloses: *(a) receiving a first attribute of a first input field type and a second attribute.....* --“Upon receiving the imported source data, it is then converted into a uniform text format.....” (Col. 6, lines 40-67). Mcallum teaches above, the conversion of an input source data file with a first attribute or format into a second output file with a second uniform format attribute.

Moreover, Mcallum discloses: *(b) generating at runtime a first optimized conversion routine based on said first attribute....* --“Upon receiving the imported source data, it is then converted into a uniform text format.....” (Col. 6, lines 40-67). Mcallum teaches above, the optimized conversion, when the program is **generated in memory—at runtime**--of an input source data file with a first attribute or format into a second output file with a second uniform format attribute using an optimized/specialized conversion engine.

Furthermore, Mcallum discloses: *(c) executing said first optimized conversion routine from said application program....* --“Upon receiving the imported source data, it is then converted into a uniform text format.....”. Mcallum teaches above, a program for the conversion of an input source data file with a **first attribute or format** into a second output file with a **second uniform format attribute** using an optimized/specialized conversion engine.

Regarding claim 2, which depends on claim 1, Mcallum discloses: *...calling said first optimized conversion routine from said application.* --“...running the data against conversion engines.....” (Col. 6, lines 43-67). Mcallum teaches above, invoking a program for the

Art Unit: 2176

conversion of an input source data file with a first attribute or format into a second output file with a second uniform format attribute using an optimized/specialized conversion engine.

Regarding claim 3, which depends on claim 1, Mcallum discloses: *...storing said first optimized conversion routine inline with said application.* --“Upon receiving the imported source data, it is then converted into a uniform text format.....” (Col. 6, lines 40-67). Mcallum teaches above, invoking a program for the conversion, and saving of an input source data file with a first attribute or format into a second output file with a second uniform format attribute using an optimized/specialized conversion engine.

Regarding claim 4, which depends on claim 1, Mcallum discloses: *...performed dynamically while said application program is executing.* --“Upon receiving the imported source data, it is then converted into a uniform text format.....” (Col. 6, lines 40-67). Mcallum teaches above, invoking a program for the dynamic conversion of an input source data file with a first attribute or format into a second output file with a second uniform format attribute using an optimized/specialized conversion engine.

Regarding claim 5, which depends on claim 1, Mcallum discloses: *(d) receiving a third attribute of a second input field type and a fourth attribute.....* --“.....This is achieved by running source data against a particular data field conversion engine specifically tailored to the requirements of the source system.....” (Col. 6, lines 56-67). Mcallum teaches above, invoking a program for the dynamic conversion of an input the converted source data file with a third attribute or format of a second input field into an output file with a third format—fourth attribute-- using a second optimized/specialized conversion engine.

In addition, Mcallum discloses: *(e) generating a second optimized conversion routine*
--“.....This is achieved by running source data against a particular data field conversion engine specifically tailored to the requirements of the source system.....” (Col. 6, lines 56-67).
Mcallum teaches above, invoking a program for the dynamic conversion of an input the converted source data file with a third attribute or format of a second input field into an output file with a third format—fourth attribute-- using a second optimized/specialized conversion engine.

Furthermore, Mcallum discloses: *(f) executing said second optimized conversion routine from said application program*..... --“.....This is achieved by running source data against a particular data field conversion engine specifically tailored to the requirements of the source system.....” (Col. 6, lines 56-67). Mcallum teaches above, invoking a program for the dynamic conversion of an input the converted source data file with a third attribute or format of a second input field into an output file with a third format—fourth attribute-- using an optimized/specialized conversion engine.

Regarding claim 6, which depends on claim 1, Mcallum discloses: *first and second attribute is character type*--“.....This is achieved by running source data against a particular data field conversion engine specifically tailored to the requirements of the source system.....” (Col. 6, lines 56-67). Mcallum teaches above, invoking a program for the dynamic conversion of an input converted source data file into an output file is of character type.

Regarding claim 7, which depends on claim 8, Mcallum discloses: *generating program debugging instrumentation*.....--“.....This updating process, thus, not only corrects

keying errors and standardizes syntax.....” (Col. 5, lines 35-44). Mcallum teaches above, the generation of cleaning routines based on the comparison against syntax rules.

Regarding independent claim 8, Mcallum discloses: *(a) receiving a plurality of input attributes from an application programs*. --“Upon receiving the imported source data, it is then converted into a uniform text format.....” (Col. 6, lines 40-67). Mcallum teaches above, the conversion of an input source data file with a first attribute or format into an output file with a different attributes.

Moreover, Mcallum discloses: *(b) dynamically generating a plurality of data field conversion routines* --“.....This is achieved by running source data against a particular data field conversion engine specifically tailored to the requirements of the source system.....” (Col. 6, lines 56-67). Mcallum teaches above, the conversion of input source data fields by dynamically generating optimized/specialized conversion engine routines.

Furthermore, Mcallum discloses: *(c) storing said plurality of data field conversion routines in memory*.... --“.....This is achieved by running source data against a particular data field conversion engine specifically tailored to the requirements of the source system.....” (Col. 6, lines 56-67). Mcallum teaches above, running an optimized/specialized conversion engine routines from memory.

Regarding claim 9, which depends on claim 8, Mcallum discloses: *...data field conversion routines are callable by said application program* --“.....This is achieved by running source data against a particular data field conversion engine specifically tailored to the requirements of the source system.....” (Col. 6, lines 56-67). Mcallum teaches above, running an optimized/specialized conversion engine routines from an application program.

Regarding claim 10, which depends on claim 8, Mcallum discloses: ...*data field conversion routines are stored inline* ... --“.....This is achieved by running source data against a particular data field conversion engine specifically tailored to the requirements of the source system.....” (Col. 6, lines 56-67). Mcallum teaches above, storing an optimized/specialized conversion engine routines along with an application program.

Regarding claim 11, which depends on claim 8, *step (b) is performed dynamically*.... --“.....This is achieved by running source data against a particular data field conversion engine specifically tailored to the requirements of the source system.....” (Col. 6, lines 56-67). Mcallum teaches above, the conversion of input source data fields by dynamically generating optimized/specialized conversion engine routines while the application is running.

Regarding claim 12, which depends on claim 8, Mcallum discloses: *input and output attribute are character type*--“.....This is achieved by running source data against a particular data field conversion engine specifically tailored to the requirements of the source system.....” (Col. 6, lines 56-67). Mcallum teaches above, invoking a program for the dynamic conversion of an input data file into the converted source data file into an output file are of character type.

Regarding claim 13, which depends on claim 8, Mcallum discloses: *input and output attribute are date type*--“.....This is achieved by running source data against a particular data field conversion engine specifically tailored to the requirements of the source system.....” (Col. 6, lines 56-67). Mcallum teaches above, invoking a program for the dynamic conversion of an input data file into the converted source data file into an output file are of data such as date type.

Regarding claim 14, which depends on claim 8, Mcallum discloses: *generating program debugging instrumentation*.....--“.....This updating process, thus, not only corrects

keying errors and standardizes syntax.....” (Col. 5, lines 35-44). Mcallum teaches above, the generation of cleaning routines based on the comparison against syntax rules.

Claims 15-20 are directed towards a computer system for implementing the steps found in claims 1-4, 13 , and 6 respectively, and are similarly rejected.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments filed 10/20/2000 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The Applicants statement that: “Mcallum, however, does not disclose ‘a method of converting a plurality of input field types to a plurality of output filed types’” (p.2, pgph.7). The Examiner disagrees with this statement, because as shown previously, in the rejection of claim 1 a method for dynamically invoking or generating in memory optimized conversion routines for converting various input fields from a source document with input fields, and input field attributes into an output document also containing input fields, and input field attributes, for the formatting of the source data.

Moreover, The Applicants statement that: “Mcallum does not disclose or suggest generating a conversion routine.....” (p.3, pgph.1). The Examiner disagrees with this statement concerning this newly added limitation, because as shown in the rejection of claim 1 above, Mcallum teaches this limitation.

Conclusion

8. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

I. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. SMITH et al. (Pat. # 6,119,137), AHLERS et al. (Pat. # 6,085,203), KOHL (Pat. # 6,163,878), and DODGE et al. (Pat. # 5,655,130).

II. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cesar B. Paula whose telephone number is (703) 306-5543. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. (EST).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon, can be reached on (703) 308-5186. However, in such a case, please allow at least one business day.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Any response to this Action should be mailed to:

Director United States Patent and Trademark Office

Washington, D.C. 20231

Or faxed to:

Art Unit: 2176

- (703) 308-9051, (for formal communications intended for entry)

Or:


- (703) 308-5403, (for informal or draft communications for discussion only, please label

“PROPOSED” or “DRAFT”).

**Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive,
Arlington, VA, Sixth Floor (Receptionist).**

CBP

12/29/00


HEATHER R. HERNDON
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100